

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

TRAVIS DELANEY WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 16-C-1319

KURT MIKUTIS, et al.

Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff Travis Delaney Williams filed several motions, which the court will address in turn. First, plaintiff requests a ninety-day extension of the discovery deadline, which is currently set for August 21, 2018. He states that attorney Michael Schaalman, who has been recruited to assist plaintiff in identifying the names of the Doe defendants, has not yet responded to his request for an update. He explains that, once the Does are identified, he will need to conduct discovery and the current deadline will not provide sufficient time to do that. The court will require plaintiff to identify the names of the Does by **August 31, 2018**. If he is unable to do so, he must notify the court promptly. The court also will grant his motion for an extension of the discovery deadline. The parties must complete discovery by **November 19, 2018**. If a party wishes to file a dispositive motion, it must do so by **December 19, 2018**.

Next, plaintiff filed a motion asking the court to reconsider its denial of his request that the court include response deadlines in every order and its denial of his request that the court order his institution to provide him with copies of his medical records. The court will deny plaintiff's motion.

Plaintiff first asserts that the law librarian would not give him additional time because the court did not include a response deadline in its order. According to the information request form plaintiff provided, plaintiff's request for additional time was denied on June 8, 2017. ECF No. 44-1. At that point, there were no pending motions in this case. Plaintiff had filed an amended complaint on March 6, 2017, which had yet to be screened. Thus, contrary to plaintiff's assertion, the librarian did not reject his request because the court had not included a response deadline in an order; the librarian rejected his request because, as she noted, there were no pending deadlines. The court will not reconsider its denial of this request.

With respect to plaintiff's request that the court order his institution to pay for copies of his medical records, the court again finds that plaintiff must comply with the institution's policies. Plaintiff asserts that he has complied with the policies; the information request form he attaches suggests otherwise. *Id.* The response plaintiff received to his request explains that he had already spent the \$50 allotted for his case. Accordingly, plaintiff did not comply with the institution's policy insofar as he sought to spend more money on this case than is allowed under the policy. The court reminds plaintiff that there is "no constitutional entitlement to subsidy" to prosecute civil lawsuits. *Lewis v. Sullivan*, 279 F.3d 526, 528 (7th Cir. 2002). It is plaintiff's responsibility to budget his limited resources. The court will not require his institution to give him additional money simply because he failed to do so. The court will deny his motion.

Finally, plaintiff filed a motion to compel. In response to several of plaintiff's discovery requests, defendants stated that they did not have any documents responsive to his requests. Plaintiff asserts that this is untrue. He explains that he has seen documents that would have been responsive. Plaintiff also indicates that he called opposing counsel at her office, but she refused to discuss his

discovery requests with him. I will require defendants to respond to plaintiff's motion by **August 14, 2018**. If plaintiff wants to reply in support of his motion, he must do so by **August 28, 2018**.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 48) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff must identify the names of the Doe defendants by **August 31, 2018**. The parties must complete discovery by **November 19, 2018**. If a party wishes to file a dispositive motion, it must do so by **December 19, 2018**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 49) is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendants must respond to plaintiff's motion to compel (ECF No. 50) by **August 14, 2018**. If plaintiff wants to reply in support of his motion, he must do so by **August 28, 2018**.

Signed in Green Bay, Wisconsin, this 31st day of July, 2018.

s/ William C. Griesbach
William C. Griesbach, Chief Judge
United States District Court